Atty. Dkt. No.: 213202-00471 PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
	:	Examiner: Peter Y. Choi
DAVID B. MCCULLOCH, ET AL.)	
	:	Group Art Unit: 1794
Application No.: 10/611,434)	
E1 1 1 1 2 2002	;	Confirmation No.: 1442
Filed: July 2, 2003)	
For: COMPOSITE STRUCTURE WITH	:	
DECORATIVE SURFACE	,	
DECORATIVE SURFACE		Me 11 2000
	,	May 11, 2009

Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT AND ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement mailed April 14, 2009, Applicants elect Group I, Claims 1-31, drawn to a composite structure, with traverse.

Since Applicants have elected Group 1, with traverse, Applicants believe that upon indication of allowable subject matter, rejoinder will be considered by the Examiner.

In response to the Election of Species Requirement, Applicants elect the following, with traverse:

Species Group I - elect Species I, wherein the core portion is a cellular material (claims readable thereon: 1-14, 16-31);

Species Group II - elect Species I, wherein the first fibrous layer and the second fibrous layer are the same, (claims readable thereon: 1-16, 18-31);

Response to Restriction/Election Requirement U.S. Pat. Appl. 10/611,434
Page 2 of 3

Species Group III - elect Species II, wherein the first fibrous layer is nonwoven, (claims readable thereof: 1-31);

Species Group IV - elect Species II, wherein the second fibrous layer is nonwoven (claims readable thereon: 1-31);

Species Group V - elect Species I, wherein each of the first fibrous layer and the second fibrous layer is a fiberglass mat (claims readable thereon: 1-21, 23-31);

Species Group VI - elect Species I, wherein the first polymer layer and the second polymer layer are the same (claims readable thereon: 1-23, 25-31); and

Species Group VII - elect Species I, wherein the first polymer layer and the second polymer are each a polyurea layer (claims readable thereon: 1-27, 29-31).

Traversal is on the grounds that a search of the art for one group of claims will necessarily include a search of the art for the other group of claims. It is believed that the burden on the Examiner to examine all claims in a single application is less than the burden on the Applicants/public to prosecute/search more than one application/patent.

Response to Restriction/Election Requirement U.S. Pat. Appl. 10/611,434
Page 3 of 3

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 625-3507. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants

Richard P. Bauer Registration No. 31,588

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP East Lobby, Suite 700 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

Facsimile: (202) 298-7570